



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/720,375	11/25/2003	Sunao Kawai	116533	4288
25944 7590 08/18/2008 OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 320850 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850				
EXAMINER				
HOANG, HIEU T				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2152				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/18/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/720,375

Applicant(s)

KAWAI, SUNAO

Examiner

HIEU T. HOANG

Art Unit

2152

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 May 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-55 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-55 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to the communication filed on 07/23/2008.
2. Claims 46-55 are new.
3. Claims 1-55 are pending.

Response to Amendment

4. The objection of the specification has been withdrawn due to the amendment.
5. The 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection of claims 42-44 has been withdrawn due to the amendment.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments on claim 1 have been fully considered but are not persuasive.
7. For claims 1, 39 and 42, applicant argues that the prior art Simpson does not disclose "a monitoring system that monitors whether a request for modification of the operational parameters issued by a second user is received during the monitoring period". The examiner respectfully disagrees. First, there is no distinction between the claimed "operational parameter" with a print job of Simpson. Therefore, a request to modify an operational parameter is any request that includes or requires changes to the print job. Simpson discloses a blocking period of a print job set or reserved by a first user, during that period, any request that requires to cancel or interrupt (or modify) the print job will be denied ([0074]-[0076]). Second, since the term "operational parameters"

is so broadly claimed, an operational parameter can also be read as attributes whether a print job is interruptable or not, or conditionally interruptable as disclosed by Simpson ([0068]). For example, an uninterruptable job setting will deny any request that conflicts with the uninterruptable job during an associated monitoring period, meaning request that needs to change that interruptability of the print job is denied. Third, an "operational parameter" can also be read as a time period associated with the print job. Any subsequent request that requires changes or interrupts the time period can be blocked ([0076]-[0078]).

8. Applicant argues that the processing time is not controlled by the user. Refer to [0074] of Simpson, a user supplies time for a processing to start. Therefore, arguments that a user cannot control time for his print job are unpersuasive. Furthermore, the claims recite "monitoring time (or period) with respect to operational parameters set by a first user." It is the operational parameters which are set by the user, not the monitoring time.

9. Repeated arguments based on same subject matter in claim 1 are unpersuasive for the same rationale above.

10. Arguments based on setting of "operational parameters" being independent from processing requests is moot in view of new ground of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

11. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the

art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

12. The specification is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to adequately teach how to make or use the invention, i.e., failing to disclose "operational parameters set by a first user independent from the first user issuing a processing request" as recited in claims 21-37, 40, 41, 43, 44, 47, 50, 51, 53, 54.

13. Applicant's disclosure is insufficient to allow one of ordinary skilled in the art to make or use the invention without undue experimentation because applicant did not adequately disclose the necessary steps to perform the method (such as in claim 170). See *In re Gunn*, 190 USPQ 402 (CCPA 1976.) In fact, the examiner cannot find any disclosure in the specification regarding "operational parameters set by a first user independent from the first user issuing a processing request".

14. Claims 21-37, 40, 41, 43, 44, 47, 50, 51, 53, 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The examiner cannot find any disclosure in the specification regarding "operational parameters set by a first user independent from the first user issuing a processing request".

15. It is suggested that applicant could overcome the U.S.C. 112 first paragraph rejection by providing a suitably detailed system diagram (with appropriate cross-

indexing in the detailed description to reference numerals on said system diagrams.) No new matter should be added.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

16. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

17. Claims 1-8, 10-15, 20, 39, 42 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Simpson et al. (US 2003/0084086, hereafter Simpson).

18. For claim 1, Simpson discloses a network system having a plurality of terminal devices and an electronic device whose function is shared by said plurality of terminal devices, said plurality of terminal devices and said electronic device being communicatively connected through a network, operational parameters of said electronic device being set by users of said plurality of terminal devices through the network (abstract, fig. 1a, 1b, printers with users' personal settings), said network system comprising:

a monitoring period determining system that determines a monitoring period with respect to operational parameters set by a first user ([0074], [0075], estimate processing time of a reserved print job with associated printing settings of a first user);

a monitoring system that monitors whether a request for modification of the operational parameters issued by a second user is received during the monitoring period ([0074]-[0076], monitor whether print job of a second user conflicts with the first user's print time and settings, monitor whether second print job requires changes (interrupt, pause, defer or interfere with) first print job); and

a modification control system that modifies the operational parameters in accordance with the request for modification if the monitoring system determines that the request for the modification is received after expiration of the monitoring period ([0076], store second print job and apply second print settings if time does not conflict),

said modification control system executing at least one of rejecting the request by the second user and outputting a message corresponding to the request by the second user if said monitoring system determines that the request for modification is received during the monitoring period ([0076], prompt the second user to select a different print time if his print time conflicts with the reserved print time with settings of the first user).

19. For claim 2, Simpson further discloses the monitoring period is defined as a time period after the operational parameters are set by the first user ([0075], period of printing with settings by the first user).

20. For claim 3, Simpson further discloses said monitoring period determining system includes a time period inputting system, the monitoring period being determined based on the time period input through said time period inputting system ([0074], [0075], reserved print job has an input start time).

21. For claim 4, Simpson further discloses an end of the monitoring period is defined as a point of time ([0075], processing time).

22. For claim 5, Simpson further discloses said monitoring period determining system includes a time inputting system, an end of the monitoring period being determined based on the point of time which is input through said time inputting system ([0074], [0075], reserved end time is based on start time and processing time).

23. For claim 6, Simpson further discloses the message output by the modification control system is a message, which is transmitted to the second user, indicating that a current time is within the monitoring period ([0076], a message to the second user to select a new start time if time conflicts).

24. For claim 7, Simpson further discloses the message output by the modification control system is a message, which is transmitted to the first user, informing that the operational parameters have been modified by the second user within the monitoring period ([0070], "job deferred" message).

25. For claim 8, Simpson further discloses a permission requesting system that requests the first user for permission to modify the operational parameters ([0070], interrupt request).

26. For claim 10, Simpson further discloses a postponed period checking system that checks whether a postponed period for postponing the modification of the operational parameters has expired, the postponed period being instructed by the terminal device, said modification controlling system enabling the modification of the operational parameters after expiration of the postponed period ([0076], postponed second print job with settings).

27. For claim 11, Simpson further discloses a setting management device which is connected with said terminal device and a plurality of electronic devices through the network, said setting management device being provided with a setting input system that is used to input modification settings of the operational parameters for said plurality of electronic devices, the modification settings input through said setting input system being set in said plurality of electronic devices (fig. 5A, 2B, [0061], client machine includes settings input module, which is a web interface).

28. For claim 12, Simpson further discloses one of said plurality of terminal devices includes said setting management device (fig. 5A, client machine includes settings module).

29. For claim 13, Simpson further discloses said setting management device includes an electronic device selecting system that selects at least one of the plurality of electronic devices as a target device whose operational parameters are to be modified, the modification settings input through said setting input system being effected as the modification settings of said at least one of the electronic devices selected by said electronic device selecting system ([0113], select a printer for printing with personal settings).

30. For claim 14, Simpson further discloses said terminal device includes an instruction system that transmits instructions to the electronic device using a predetermined communication protocol ([0041], e.g., HArmstrongP); and wherein said electronic device includes a job executing system that executes a job which is instructed by said instruction system and transmitted from said terminal device using the predetermined communication protocol ([0041], [0054], send jobs to printer using a protocol), the operational parameters including a parameter to be used when said electronic device communicates with said terminal device using the predetermined communication protocol (abstract, job with selected options).

31. For claim 15, Simpson further discloses said electronic device includes a printing system, the operational parameters including a parameter related to an output format when said electronic device prints a print job with said printing system ([0066], finishing options of print jobs).

32. For claim 20, Simpson further discloses said electronic device includes an interruption procedure execution system that executes an interruption procedure when a predetermined job is executed, the operational parameters including a parameter that enables/disables execution of the interruption procedure during the predetermined job ([0070], interrupt an executed print job).

33. Claims 39 and 42 are rejected for the same rationale in claim 1.

34. For claim 45, Simpson discloses a network system having a plurality of terminal devices and an electronic device whose function is shared by said plurality of terminal devices, said plurality of terminal devices and said electronic device being communicatively connected through a network, operational parameters of said electronic device being set by users of said plurality of terminal devices through the network, said network system comprising:

a monitoring condition determining system that determines a monitoring condition with respect operational parameters set by a first user ([0074]-[0076], monitoring duration of a first user's print job with associated settings);

a monitoring system that monitors whether a request for modification of the operational parameters received from a second user meets the monitoring condition

Art Unit: 2152

([0076], determining whether second user request is in a "black out" period set by the first user);

a modification control system that modifies the operational parameters in accordance with the request for modification if the monitoring system determines that the request for the modification meets the monitoring condition, said modification control system executes a predetermined operation if said monitoring system determines that the request for modification does not meet the monitoring condition ([0076], apply second print settings if outside blacked out period).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

35. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

36. Claims 21-25, 27-32, 37, 40, 43, 46, 47, 49, 50, 52, 53, and 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Simpson, in view of Parry (US 2003/0030664)

37. For claim 21, Simpson discloses a network system having a plurality of terminal devices and an electronic device whose function is shared by said plurality of terminal devices, said plurality of terminal devices and said electronic device being

communicatively connected through a network, operational parameters of said electronic device being set by users of said plurality of terminal devices through the network, said network system comprising:

a number of execution determining system that determines the number of times of operations to be executed by said electronic device in accordance with operational parameters set by a first user ([0075], determine number of pages or copies to be printed with associated settings by a first user);

a monitoring system that monitors whether time required for the number of executed operations of said electronic device exceeds time required for the number of times (of operations) determined by said number of execution determining system when a request for modification of the operational parameters issued by a second user is received ([0076], [0077], [0070], determining conflicts when a second user reserve a second print job when pages or copies of a first user's print job are being processed);
and

a modification control system that modifies the operational parameters in accordance with the request for modification if the monitoring system determines that the time at executed operations of said electronic device exceeds the processing time of the number of times determined by said number of execution determining system ([0076], store job and apply second print settings if time does not conflict),

said modification control system executing at least one of rejecting the request by the second user and outputting a message corresponding to the request by the second user if said monitoring system determines that the time at the number of executed

operations of said electronic device is equal to or less than the processing time of the number of times determined by said number of execution determining system ([0076], prompt the second user to select a different print time if his print time conflicts with the reserved print time with settings of the first user).

Simpson does not explicitly disclose that monitoring is based on number of executed operations.

However, Simpson discloses monitoring is based on time period that is determined based on number of operations (such as number of pages or copies) ([0075], [0070])

Simpson does not explicitly disclose operational parameters are set independently from issuing a processing request by a user; although Simpson discloses that printer parameters or settings can be set for a certain user for a certain time period without mentioning which particular print jobs or processing requests are associated with the settings ([0068])

However, Parry discloses the same (fig. 3, 4, panels for printer settings separate from print job processing)

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Simpson and Parry so that determining a "blackened out" stage of modification requests from subsequent users can be done based on number of executed operations of the device instead of time monitoring so that subsequent users can only request print jobs outside the "blackened out" stage set by the first user ([Simpson, 0076]) to simplify or provide an alternative to Simpson's monitoring,

and to have separate printer settings from printer processing so that users can provide settings in advance of processing for example.

38. For claim 22, Simpson further discloses said terminal device includes an instruction system that instructs said electronic device to execute a job; wherein said electronic device includes a job executing system that executes the job instructed by said terminal device, said number of execution determining system determining the number of executions of the job to be executed by said job executing system ([0075], fig. 2a, production device, a printer for executing print pages for a first user).

39. For claim 23, Simpson further discloses the message output by the modification control system is a message, which is transmitted to the second user, indicating that the number of executed operations of said electronic device is equal to or less than the number of times determined by said number of execution determining system ([0076], second user is prompted to select another start time because first user's print job is in execution).

40. For claim 24, Simpson further discloses the message output by the modification control system is a message, which is transmitted to the first user, informing that the operational parameters have been modified by the second user before the number of executed operations of said electronic device exceeds the number of times determined

by said number of execution determining system ([0070], interrupt request and job deferred messages to the first user).

41. Claims 25 and 27-32 are rejected for the same rationale as in claims 8 and 10-15 respectively.

42. Claim 37 is rejected for the same rationale as in claim 20.

43. Claims 40 and 43 are rejected for the same rationale in claim 21.

44. For claim 46, Simpson further discloses the operational parameters comprise functional parameters and protection parameters, the protection parameters being parameters entered by a first user, independent from a processing request, to control the modification of the functional parameters; and the monitoring period determining system determines the monitoring period with respect to the protection parameters set by the first user ([0068], protection parameters are user settings regarding when certain printer parameters or functional parameters can be set, e.g. all boss's print jobs can be set so that they are uninterruptable independently of the print job request (by only checking the name of the boss) and when functional parameters can be set, for example (examiner's interpretation), from 2 to 4 PM, Andy's jobs with certain settings are uninterruptable).

Simpson does not explicitly disclose operational parameters are set independently from issuing a processing request by a user; although Simpson discloses that printer parameters or settings can be set for a certain user for a certain time period without mentioning which particular print jobs or processing requests are associated with the settings ([0068])

However, Parry discloses the same (fig. 3, 4, panels for printer settings separate from print job processing)

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Simpson and Parry to have separate printer settings from printer processing so that users can provide settings in advance of processing for example.

45. For claim 47, Simpson-Parry further discloses the operational parameters comprise functional parameters and protection parameters, the protection parameters being parameters entered by a first user, independent from a processing request, to control the modification of the functional parameters (Simpson, [0068], protection parameters are user settings regarding when certain printer parameters or functional parameters can be set, e.g. all boss's print jobs can be set so that they are uninterruptable independently of the print job request (by only checking the name of the boss) and when functional parameters can be set, for example (examiner's interpretation), from 2 to 4 PM, Andy's jobs with certain settings are uninterruptable); and

the number of execution determining system determines the number of times of operations to be executed by said electronic device in accordance with the protection parameters set by the first user (Simpson, [0076], [0077], [0070], determining when pages or copies of a first user's print job are being processed and being interruptable or non-interruptable).

46. Claims 49, 52 and 55 are rejected for the same rationale as in claim 46.
47. Claims 50 and 53 are rejected for the same rationale as in claim 47.
48. Claims 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Simpson, in view of Official Notice.

49. For claims 16-19, Official Notice is taken that user's settings relating to output format of a print job such as banner print, sheet supply, default sheet and default tray are well-known in the art (see e.g., Costello, US 5,547,178)

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Simpson and what has been known in the art to apply user's settings relating to output format to Simpson's print jobs to provide customized printing options for the users.

50. Claims 33-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Simpson-Parry, in view of Official Notice.

51. For claims 33-36, Official Notice is taken that user's settings relating to output format of a print job such as banner print, sheet supply, default sheet and default tray are well-known in the art (see e.g., Costello, US 5,547,178)

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Simpson-Parry and what has been known in the art to apply user's settings relating to output format to Simpson's print jobs to provide customized printing options for the users.

52. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Simpson, in view of Nakamura et al. (US 2002/0161740, hereafter Nakamura).

53. For claim 9, Simpson further discloses an effective period determining system that determines whether an effective period designated by the terminal device has expired. Simpson does not explicitly disclose a recovering system that sets the operational parameters to previously set values after expiration of the effective period.

However, Nakamura discloses the same ([0099]-[0101], restore the default settings after a period of customized user's setting has expired)

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Simpson and Nakamura to reduce the potential effects (conflicts) on other users.

54. Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Simpson-Parry, in view of Nakamura.

55. For claim 26, Simpson-Parry further discloses an effective period determining system that determines whether an effective period designated by the terminal device

has expired. Simpson does not explicitly disclose a recovering system that sets the operational parameters to previously set values after expiration of the effective period.

However, Nakamura discloses the same ([0099]-[0101], restore the default settings after a period of customized user's setting has expired)

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Simpson-Parry and Nakamura to reduce the potential effects (conflicts) on other users.

56. Claims 38, 48, 51, 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Simpson, in view of Armstrong et al. (US 2004/0039779, hereafter Armstrong).

57. For claim 38, Simpson discloses the invention as in claim 1, Simpson further discloses:

a message storing system that stores a message with which the operational parameters are modified in relationship with modified operational parameters (fig. 2A, storage devices, [0076], [0074], e.g., messages indicating "interrupt request" or "job deferred" associated with print jobs with different settings); and

a message outputting system that outputs the message stored in relationship with the modified operational parameters by said message storing system in response to an output command of a message corresponding to the modified operational parameters ([0070], output, e.g., "job deferred" message when print job is changed or modified and second settings are applied).

Simpson does not explicitly disclose that the message is input by a user of the terminal device.

However, Armstrong discloses using customized messages that can be input by a user instead of default messages ([0110]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Simpson and Armstrong to customize status messages to provide the message receiver more details about the status messages (Armstrong, [0110]).

58. Claims 41, 44, 48, 51, 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Simpson, in view of Armstrong and Parry.

59. For claim 41, Simpson discloses an electronic device for a network system having a plurality of terminal devices and an electronic device whose function is shared by said plurality of terminal devices, said plurality of terminal devices and said electronic device being communicatively connected through a network, operational parameters of said electronic device being set by said plurality of terminal devices through the network, said network system comprising:

a modifying system that modifies the operational parameters in accordance with a request for modification of the operational parameters requested by a terminal device ([0076], second user requests to print job with a second settings other than first user's settings);

a message storing system that stores a message with which the operational parameters are modified in relationship with modified operational parameters (fig. 2A, storage devices, [0076], [0074], e.g., messages indicating "interrupt request" or "job deferred" associated with print jobs with different settings); and

a message outputting system that outputs the message stored in relationship with the modified operational parameters by said message storing system in response to an output command of a message corresponding to the modified operational parameters ([0070], output, e.g., "job deferred" message when print job is changed or modified and second settings are applied).

Simpson does not explicitly disclose that the message is input by a user of the terminal device.

However, Armstrong discloses using customized messages that can be input by a user instead of default messages ([0110]).

Simpson does not explicitly disclose operational parameters are requested independently from issuing a processing request by a user; although Simpson discloses that printer parameters or settings can be set for a certain user for a certain time period without mentioning which particular print jobs or processing requests are associated with the settings ([0068])

However, Parry discloses the same (fig. 3, 4, panels for printer settings separate from print job processing)

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Simpson, Armstrong and Parry to customize

status messages to provide the message receiver more details about the status messages (Armstrong, [0110]) and to have separate printer settings from printer processing so that users can provide settings in advance of processing for example.

60. Claim 44 is rejected for the same rationale as in claim 41.

61. For claim 48, Simpson-Armstrong further discloses the operational parameters comprise functional parameters and protection parameters, the protection parameters being parameters entered by the first user, independent from a processing request, to control the modification of the functional parameters (Simpson, [0068], protection parameters are user settings regarding when certain printer parameters or functional parameters can be set, e.g. all boss's print jobs can be set so that they are uninterruptable independently of the print job request (by only checking the name of the boss) and when functional parameters can be set, for example (examiner's interpretation), from 2 to 4 PM, Andy's jobs with certain settings are uninterruptable);

the message storing system stores a message input by the first user of the terminal device with which the functional parameters and protection parameters are modified in relationship with modified functional parameters and protection parameters; and the message outputting system outputs the message stored in relationship with the modified functional parameters and protection parameters by said message storing system in response to an output command of a message corresponding to the modified functional parameters and protection parameters (Simpson, fig. 2A, storage devices, [0076], [0074], e.g., messages indicating "interrupt request" or "job deferred" associated

with print jobs with different settings; [0070], output, e.g., "job deferred" message when print job is changed or modified and second settings are applied, Armstrong, [0110]).

Simpson-Armstrong does not explicitly disclose operational parameters are requested independently from issuing a processing request by a user; although Simpson discloses that printer parameters or settings can be set for a certain user for a certain time period without mentioning which particular print jobs or processing requests are associated with the settings ([0068])

However, Parry discloses the same (fig. 3, 4, panels for printer settings separate from print job processing)

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Simpson, Armstrong and Parry to customize status messages to provide the message receiver more details about the status messages (Armstrong, [0110]) and to have separate printer settings from printer processing so that users can provide settings in advance of processing for example.

62. Claims 51 and 54 are rejected for the same rationale as in claim 48.

Conclusion

63. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure is disclosed in form PTO 392.

64. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

65. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hieu T. Hoang whose telephone number is 571-270-1253. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 8 a.m.-5 p.m., EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on 571-272-3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2152

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

HH

/Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2152